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Our Session Goals

- Federal Grantee Landscape
- Grounding the Evaluation
- Roles of Logic Model and Collaboration Map
- Grantee Experiences
Who’s in the Audience? Your goals?

- Evaluators working with Federal Programs?
  - Education
  - Health
  - Science
- Evaluators Measuring Collaborative Efforts?
- Others?
Federal Grant Landscape

- Collapsing of Programs
- Grants to Cooperative Agreements
- Requirement for “Collaboration”
- Performance Measurement
- Annual Reporting
National Assessment Center
National Center on Educational Outcomes

Mission:

To support the development of inclusive assessment in a rapidly changing state (and consortium) assessment system environment in order to promote improved educational results for students with disabilities.
National Assessment Center Activities

Knowledge Development

Technical Assistance and Dissemination

Leadership and Coordination
Collaboration: Research and Evaluation

- Theoretical Model, Evaluation Questions and Design (Judy)
- Logic Model and Collaboration Mapping (David)
- What’s it Mean to us? Grantee Perspective (Laurene)
- Discussant, Q & A (Vitaliy)
Grounding the Evaluation: Literature Review, Design Development & Components
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Goals

1) So, you want to measure Collaboration. Where to begin?

2) How do others measure Collaboration?

3) With all this information, how does it fit your agency’s needs and goals?
Where to begin: Literature Review

- Journal articles
- Program and evaluation-related web sites
- PowerPoint presentations

**GOAL:** Gain broad understanding
Where to begin: Program Documents

- Evaluation questions, performance measures
- Team meetings, planning discussions
- Logic models

**GOAL:** Gain program-specific understanding
Where to begin: Ask Questions

*What* do you want to know about collaboration?

*When* do you want to ask questions?

*Who* do you want to ask?

*How* do you want to ask these questions?

*Why* does each question matter? How will findings be applied, utilized?

**GOAL:** Narrow focus for evaluation
Review Existing Tools and Frameworks

Levels of Collaboration Outcomes

Collaboration for the 21st Century

Dimensions Of Collaboration

Levels of Integration

Levels of Collaboration
Review existing tools, cont’d

- Levels of Collaboration Scale
- The Collaboration Checklist
- Wilder Collaboration Factors Inventory
- Collaboration Implementation Rubric
- CFSA Collaboration Planning and Assessment Tool
- Strategic Alliance Formative Assessment Rubric (SAFAR)
- IDEA Partnership Success Rating Scale
- Communities of Practice: Collaboration Assessment Rubric (CoPCAR)
NCEO was tasked by funder to partner with others.

While each has own focus, they are expected to collaborate with one another.

The purpose of the evaluation was to measure:

1. Strength/types of collaboration *across* Centers;
2. Strength/types of collaboration *among* Centers and key partners;
3. Quality/benefits of the collaboration *across* Centers; and
4. Quality/benefits of the collaboration *among* Centers and key partners.
Evaluation Questions

1) What do clients understand about the Center and what it does?

2) What does the Center understand about their partners’ role, mission and work?

3) To what extent is the Center engaged in activities that support collaboration?

4) What are the benefits/advantages of the collaboration?

5) What is the quality of joint TA?
Evaluation Methodology

• Mixed methods approach
• Process data collected annually
• Outcome data: benefits and quality of collaboration
Data Collection Design & Instrumentation

1) Collaboration mapping
2) Online survey
3) 1:1 interviews with key partners and clients
4) Case studies with clients receiving various TA
Recap: To measure collaboration…

1) Review literature, program documents, meeting minutes, logic model ask questions!

2) Investigate existing tools, frameworks & methods

3) Apply to your agency’s needs and goals
Logic Model and Collaboration Mapping
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Collaborative Logic Model

• Collaborative Logic Model: separate and distinct
• Purpose: guide theoretical framework(s), methodology, instrumentation and timing
• Activities: align with levels of collaboration
NCEO Partner Collaborative Logic Model

**Purpose:** The overarching goal of collaboration at the National Center on Educational Outcomes is to provide national leadership and coordination in developing educational assessments and accountability systems that appropriately monitor educational results for all students, including students with disabilities, English language learners (ELLs), and ELLs with disabilities.

### Inputs

- **Partnerships**
  - NCEO
  - Technical Assistance Center
  - Data Center

- **Critical Knowledge Base**
  - IDEA
  - Challenges to implementation
  - Assessment systems
  - Implementation science
  - Effective practices
  - Outcomes measurement

- **Established Relationships**
  - Learning Communities
  - Communities of Practice
  - Partners
  - Consortia, States, Agency Partners, & Associations

- **U.S. Dept of Education**
  - OSEF
  - OSEP

### Activities

- **Communication:** "Assemble and Form"
  - Communication/Networking
    - Conduct regular calls with key partners (e.g., CoP, ELPA21, Consortia)
    - Conduct annual face-to-face events (e.g., CCSSO pre-conference, Advisory Committee)
    - Develop common language & framework
    - Share performance measures & logic models (e.g., EFC, OSEP)
    - Share NCEO website
    - Conduct informal interpersonal communication networking
    - Interface with others for publication activities

- **Cooperation:** "Storm and Order"
  - Shared information and mutual support
    - Inform each other of TA services and product development
    - Share resources & information across TA efforts
    - Interface with others for publication activities

- **Coordination:** "Norm and Perform"
  - Common tasks and compatible goals
    - Gather, sort, and store in a central location products, tools, & processes utilized by partners
    - Identify/initiate & pursue collaborative activities
    - Coordinate efforts to provide joint TA
    - Coordinate efforts to develop joint products (e.g., CSAI)
    - Refer clients to partners
    - Interface with others for publication activities

- **Collaboration:** "Transform"
  - Integrated strategies and collective purpose
    - Participate in annual events that demonstrate national leadership
    - Engage in collaborative partnerships to provide TA
    - Support Consortia & SEAs to promote collaboration and information sharing
    - Gather & incorporate stakeholder input into partner decisions and planning
    - Interface with others for publication activities

### Outcomes

- **Relationships**
  - Enhanced individual capacity of partners
  - Collaborative members (Consortia, States, Agency Partners, & Associations) use common strategies to foster productive, efficient & sustainable relationships with each other
  - New relationships are developed

- **Collaborative Presence**
  - Partners develop common products, tools & services to establish collaborative presence
  - Partners use common products, tools, & services to establish collaborative presence
  - Partners gain national reputation for leadership and coordination
  - Dissemination activities result in collaborative presence
  - Partners develop joint products, tools, & services

- **Collaborative Technical Assistance**
  - Delivery of joint products, tools & services to consortia, states, agency partners & associations
  - Collaborative sharing of resources & funds assists partners in non-duplication of efforts
  - Collaborative work results in TA that is effective and cost efficient

### Impacts

- **Effective Work with Partners**
  - Increased access to resources
  - Increased availability of resources
  - Improved and informed TA
  - Improved products, tools, and services
  - Increased capacity and professional knowledge of partners
  - Increased understanding of roles/missions of each partner by Consortia, States, Agency Partners, & Associations
  - Utilization of common language among NCEO, Consortia, States, Agency Partners, & Associations

- **Enhanced Assessment Policies & Practices**
  - Assessments in which students with disabilities participate improve in quality
  - States/Consortia improve accountability for results
  - States/Consortia use of assessment results for decision making improves
NCEO Collaboration Logic Model

Inputs

Activities

Outcomes

Impacts
Levels of Collaboration Survey

This form is designed for those who work in one of the organization or programs that are partners in the *Safe Schools, Healthy Students* initiative. Please review these descriptions of different levels of collaboration.

- On the response section at the bottom of the page, please circle the name of the organization or group with which you are associated.
- Using the scale provided, please indicate the extent to which you currently interact with each other (Skip your own row)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five Levels of Collaboration and Their Characteristics</th>
<th>Networking 1</th>
<th>Collaboration 2</th>
<th>Coordination 3</th>
<th>Coalition 4</th>
<th>Collaboration 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aware of organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Loosely defined roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Little communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All decisions are made independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide information to each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Somewhat defined roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Formal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All decisions are made independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Share information and resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Defined roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Frequent communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some shared decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Share ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Share resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Frequent and prioritized communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All members have a vote in decisions making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Members belong to one system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Frequent communication is characterized by mutual trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consensus is reached on all decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe Schools, Health Students Partners</th>
<th>No Interaction at All</th>
<th>Networking</th>
<th>Cooperation</th>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Coalition</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Agency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Education Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Prevention Counselors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School Programs Director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Improvement Teams</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Je größer ein Spielerkreis ist, desto mehr Pässe hat er angenommen/gespielt. Die Verbindungen zeigen die häufigsten Passpartner.
### MI3-CEN Levels of Linkage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>MI3-CEN Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking 1</td>
<td>Communicate for a common understanding</td>
<td>Non-hierarchical</td>
<td>Low key leadership</td>
<td>CEN working with the MAPs in the creation and updates of: MI3 Snapshots/Director and In-Brief Project Descriptions. MI3-CEN providing updates for OSE-EIS to share with the MI Association of Administrators of Special Education (MAASE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance 2</td>
<td>Match needs and provide information Limit duplication of services Ensure tasks are done Increase cooperation</td>
<td>Central body of people as communication hub Semi-formal links Roles somewhat defined Links are advisory Group leverages/raises money</td>
<td>Facilitative leaders Complex decision making Some conflict Formal communication within the central group</td>
<td>MI3 Leadership Meetings MI3 Community Learning Forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership 3</td>
<td>Coordinate and share resources to address common issues Merge resource base to create something new</td>
<td>Central body of people consists of decision makers Formalized links Defined roles Groups develops new resources and joint budget</td>
<td>Autonomous leadership but focus is on issues Group decision making in central and subgroup Communication is frequent and clear</td>
<td>MI Alliance, MSEMP, MiBLSi worked together on the planning and delivery of the FEB CLF LIO, MI Alliance, MSEMP, and Project find helping with the planning and delivery of the RTSL April 11 event: parent involvement as a dropout prevention strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition 4</td>
<td>Share ideas and be willing to pull resources from existing systems Develop commitment for a minimum of three years</td>
<td>All members involved in decision making Roles and time defined Links formal with written agreement Group develops new resources and joint budget</td>
<td>Shared leadership Decisions making formal with all members Communication is common and prioritized</td>
<td>Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners (RTSL) and The Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP) focusing on dropout prevention MIN and MiBLSi focusing on RTI and Implementation Science training to ISDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration 5</td>
<td>Accomplish shared vision and impact benchmarks Build interdependent system to address issues and opportunities</td>
<td>Consensus used in shared decisions making Roles, time and evaluation formalized Links are formal and written in work assignments</td>
<td>Leadership high, trust level high, productivity high Ideas and decisions equally shared Highly developed communication</td>
<td>Braiding services and resources for START, MiBLSi and MITS Co-location of multiple projects within one building, sharing resources, alignment of duties and development of joint/shared office protocols Merging of MI3 and CEN staff and work to essentially one infrastructure support initiative with multiple support functions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not Interacting 0**
You know about the Initiative but are not currently interacting or working with them in any way.
Digital Dashboard
What’s it Mean to us?
Grantee Perspective
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NCEO’s Focus on Collaboration

- Partners employ common strategies and language
- Partners develop common products, tools, and services
- Non-duplication of efforts
- Cost efficiency
Benefits of Collaboration

- Co-sponsorship of TA products, tools, and services
- Assisting clients no matter whom they call (efficiency of ‘triage’)
- Communicating activities using similar language across TA providers
- Sharing resources/funds for cost-effective, complimentary efforts
- Cost of TA with centers operating jointly versus separately
- Increased availability of resources
Collaboration Challenges

- Difficulties associated with initial stages of evaluation
- Staff members’ lack of time
- Delayed accomplishments
- Duplication of efforts
- Working with diverse organizations
Collaboration Data Collection Schedule

- **Design assessment of NCEO collaborations – November 2013 - February 2014**
- **Develop collaboration logic model – February 26, 2014**
- **Refine data collection tools – April-May, 2014**
- **Collect collaboration data – ongoing**
- **Develop additional data collection tools – Fall, 2014**
Current Data Collection

- Technical Assistance Documentation Tool
- Where in the World Tool
- Collaboration Survey for Partners
- Website linkage analysis
Technical Assistance Tool Questions
Collaboration Survey for Partners
If I'd known they wanted me to use all this info—I would never have asked for it!
Current Data Collection

- Technical Assistance Documentation Tool
- Where in the World Tool
- Collaboration Survey for Partners
- Website linkage analysis
Discussant
Q & A
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Thank you!
For additional information contact:

Pat Mueller, Judy Lee &
David Merves
Evergreen Evaluation & Consulting, Inc.
pat@evergreenevaluation.net
ejudy@eecvt.com
david@eecvt.com

Laurene Christensen &
Vitaliy Shyyan
National Center on Educational Outcomes
chri1010@umn.edu
shyya001@umn.edu